REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1, 3-5, 10-14, 16-19 and 22-36, 38-39 remain pending in the present application. Claims 12-14 and 16-18 have been previously withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 31 is objected to because of a semicolon. That claim is being amended to delete the semicolon and use a comma in its place.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 10-11, 19, 25, 27 and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because the claims recite "allowing" or "allow," and allegedly those terms do not provide positive recitation. Without conceding to the propriety of the rejection, applicants are amending independent claims 1, 19, 31 and 33 to delete the words "allowing" or "allow." The claims now recite their respective elements positively.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 4-5, 10, 19, 25, 27-28 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0042022 to Kirkpatrick et al. ("Kirkpatrick"). Despite Applicants' previous argument that Kirkpatrick does not disclose or suggest every element claimed, the Examiner maintains the rejections over

Kirkpatrick, citing particularly, Kirkpatrick's paragraph [0009]. While not agreeing with the Examiner, applicants in this reply are amending the independent claims to further clarify what is being claimed. Specifically, independent claim 1 is being amended to recite, "receiving a user login using user's account at a web site associated with the manufacturer." Similarly, independent claims 19, 31 and 33 are being amended to recite, "wherein a web site associated with the manufacturer receives a user login using user's account subsequent to the time of purchase." Support for the amendment can be found on page 6, lines 18-22 and page 11, lines 15-16 of the originally submitted specification.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim, that is, the cited reference must disclose an identical invention. See, MPEP §2131. Kirkpatrick does not disclose or suggest every element claimed. For instance, Kirkpatrick does not disclose or suggest, "receiving a user login using user's account at a web site associated with the manufacturer," claimed in claim 1 as amended and similarly claimed in claims 19, 31 and 33 as amended.

The Examiner cites Kirkpatrick's paragraph [0009] and particularly the discussion of the purchase transaction completion point to reject applicants arguments. The Examiner misinterprets that passage. While that passage of Kirkpatrick describes identifying during the purchase transaction a completion point representative of when the purchase is complete, and displaying the online registration form subsequent to completion point for allowing a user to register, alas, Kirkpatrick is still referring to the same online transaction that included the purchase. Nowhere in Kirkpatrick is there a suggestion that a user logs into customer's account

at Website associated with manufacturer's location subsequent to the time of purchase, and completes the registration process.

Unlike Kirkpatrick that discloses consumers completing registration at the point of purchase at the retailer site only, the independent claims of the present application recite that user "subsequently" completes the registration, using the web page generated with the information previously transmitted to the manufacturer at the time of the purchase.

For at least the above reasons, Kirkpatrick does not anticipate claims 1, 19, 31 and 33 and their respective dependent claims by at least virtue of dependency.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 22-24, 27-28, 31 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kirkpatrick in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0025245 to Flickinger et al. ("Flickinger"). Claims 11, 29-30, 32, 36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kirkpatrick in view of Flickinger, still in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0034609 to Dovolis ("Dovolis"). Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kirkpatrick in view of Flickinger and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,069,941 to Byrd et al. ("Byrd").

Because Kirkpatrick fails to disclose or suggest the elements of independent claims as discussed above with respect to section 102(e) rejection, and because the rest of the references do not make up for which Kirkpatrick apparently lacks, claims 3, 22-24, 27-28, 31 and 33-36,

claims 11, 29-30, 32 and 36, and claims 38-39 are also believed to be patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons. Further, the cited references do not disclose or suggest, allowing a user to verify and update the information transmitted at the time of purchase, when the user subsequently logs on to complete the registration.

This communication is believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and every effort has been made to place the application in condition for allowance. A favorable Office Action is hereby earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

Eunhee Park

Eunhee Park
Registration No.: 42,976

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

EP:vh